## THE COVODE INVESTIGATION.

Corruptions of the Aminist APOLOGY OF THE MINORITY.

Lore Gents from the Testimony. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Committee appointed under the resolutions d by the Hon. John Covode, and adopted by the on the 5th of March last, entered upon their les on Tue-day, March 20, 1860, and have pursued with as much assiduity as the circumstances un-which they were appointed, and the events follow-

the adoption of the resolutions, would allow. ed in pursuing their investigations for several rea First, because, although they had been clothed this House with power to send for persons and pa no appropriation of money was made by Con-suntil the 24th day of May last. Your Committherefore, did not feel at liberty to summon wit-From a distance to attend upon their investiga e then held would be compelled to take the certificant the Clerk in discharge of their fees and dispose their here in Washington at a discount. In some nees the Chairman of your Committee has far

there here in Washington at a discount. In some stances the Chairman of your Committee has faralished his own money to aid in carrying forward the investigation. In other instances, your Committee have summoned, as witnesses, persone whem they have have have in the city, in preference to sending for particular distance, when there had been no provision in he in Congress for the payment of their fees.

Ay 1 On the 28th day of March hast, the President he United States saw fit to submit to this he would be under the Committee. This seems to your Committee to have been a proclamation to the world had the whole power of the Executive, instead of being exercised to forward an investigation into its administration of affairs, would be exercised to protect has who might choose to disobey the summons of the Spaker of this House, or who, having obeyed the ammons, might refuse to testify before your Committee. In any event, it was a declaration on the part of the President of the United States which his afherents would not fail to regard. Under these circumstances your Committee have prosecuted their investigation to be great an extent as the time and means allowed them would permit. The President in his protest having denied the power of the House "to investigate whether the President of the United States, or any other other of the Government, has, by money, patremage, or other improper means, single to influence the action of Congress or any Committee thereof for or against the passage of any bill pertaining to the rights of any State or Territory;" and the investigation whether the President has failed, or efused, to compet the execution of any law thereof;" your committee have thought proper, in the first instance, examine the history of Congress and ascertain if the were any precedents which might control their enduct.

Regarding the construction of the first clause of the

Regarding the construction of the first clause of the resolution as one involving the abuse of the power of the flowerment by any officer thereof, your Committee and, upon examination, that as early as the 8th of February, 1826, the following resolution was submitted to the Senate by Mr. Macon, and adopted:

On the 4th of the following May, Mr. Benton, from

or Committee, presented a report, from or Committee make the following extracts:

The patronage of the Federal Government at the beginning founded upon a revenue of \$2.000,000. It is now operating a \$2.200,000, and within the lifetime of many now living to operate upon \$50,000. On the whole revenue must in a years be whelly applicable to subjects of patronage. Fower over a man's support has always been held and admitted by power over his will. The President has power over upport of all these officers, and they are the power over upon the subjects of the power over his will.

shoeses from the circle of his friends and supporters, and may diamins them, and, upon all the principles of human action, will disules them as eften as they disappoint his expectation. His spirit will animate their action in all the elections of State and Federal effects.

"We must, them, look forward to the time when the public revenue will be doubled; when the civil and military officers of the Federal Government will be quadrupled; when its industries over individuals will be multiplied to en indefinite extent; when the measuration by the Fresident will carry any mean through the Senate, and his recommendation can carry any measure through the two Houses of Congress, where the principle of public action will be open and avowed. The Fresident wants my vote and I want his patrongs: I will vote as he wishes and he will give me the office I wish for."

These which in 1826 were words of prophecy, seem already to have met their fulfillment and become the stern record of history. On the 28th of March, 1828, Mr. James Buchanan,

then a Senator from Pennsylvania, speaking upon this

On the 28th of March, 1828, Mr. Jumes Bucharan, then a Senator from Pennsylvania, speaking upon this subject, said:

"The nature of man is the same under republics and under monarchies. The history of the human race proves that liberty can sever long be preserved without popular jesionsy. It is a condition of its enjoyment that our rulers must be narrowly witched.

It is a main of deepots that the people should never inquire into the concerns of government. Those who have enalayed manklad, from Casar to Bomaparte, have always endeavored by presenting them with amusement and by every other means in their pawer, to starte the attention of the psonle from the conduct of their rulers.

If the Government has been admiratered upon correct principles, an intollight of the care that every abuse shall be corrected.

"It is true that in times like the present the republic is always most indianger when the clouds of adversity are lowering ever the country, and when direct taxation becomes necessary for the support of the Government the people are watchful and peaks and will then attend strictly to their own concerns. It is in the haleyon days of peace and prosperity, when the jealousy of the people elumber, that showed are selled; to teal into the administration with correption, but I do meat solemnly because Administration with correption; but I do meat solemnly because Administration with correption; but I do meat solemnly becaused that the strengthen but rather to weaken the Administration by which it was distributed. If that gentleman's character for candor were not above suspicion, as I truly believe it to be, I should doubt his sincerity. To establish this position he way for each not the gentleman to the performance of the gentleman know the administration loses more by disappointed candidates than they go in by their appointments. But sooks not the gentleman know that when a man is once appointed to office at a future time.

For my part, juding from history, when this Government was commencing its operations, and

For my part, juding from history, when this Government was commencing its operations, and when its patrongs was comparatively small, it required the Jamenta weight of character which the Father of his Country possessed to put the wheels of the mechine into successful motion. I think there was thet more danger of a dissolution than a consolidation of the Country federacy. I should then when the words had some meaning have been a Federalist, and I shall never the assumed of the name. The tissue have since greatly changed. The power and patronge of this Government have been extended, and ato felt in every neighborhood in this wast empire. There is now infinitely more changer of consolidation than dismrton, and the State a should now he selous of every secreachment input their rights. The argument of an occlosure would put them to sleep. Upon his theory the British Covernment must be very weak heasters it pressures ten, may I may say, twenty the British Covernment must be very weak heasters it pressures ten, may I may say, twenty the British Covernment time by the property of the Government. (Gains & Scaton's Eng. Deb. Vol. 4, Part 9, page 1922.)

On the 6th of Januarry, 1835, Mr. Californi submitted.

On the 6th of January, 1835, Mr. Calboun submitted, in the Senate, the following resolution, which was

"Resided, That a Select Committee be appointed to families into the extent of executive patronse, the circumstances which have contributed to its great increase of iste, the expediency and presidentiality of reducing the same, and the means of such reduce they and that they have have to reput by bill or otherwise."

From his report on that resolution, your Committee take the following extract:

"S.

Take the following extract:

"So loss as offices were considered as public trusts, to be conferred an the knows; the feithful sad or sable, for the common good, and not for the hearst or gain of the facument or inspect, and so losg as it was the practice of the Government to continue in office those who faithfully performed their duties, this patronege, in point of fact, was finited to the mere power of neutrating to accidental vasancies or to merely created offices, and could of course exercite but a limited inflatione either over the body of the community or office-holders themselves. But when this practice was reversed, when offices instead of being considered as public trusts to be conterred on the deserving, were regarded as the spells of victory, to be bestowed as powerds for

the culies budy, of those in office into consequence of parent, and to make up a bost of bungry greedy and subservient partisans for every service however been and contract. More a premium effected for the best means of extending the power of patronage, to destroy the love of country and to substitute a sufficient of the extending the power of discourage virtoe, and, in a word, to prepare for the subversion of discourage virtoe, and, in a word, to prepare for the subversion of filtering the extending the extending the position, no scheme more perfect could be devised, and such subspection, no scheme more perfect could be devised, and such subspection, no scheme more perfect to the extending the parent of the Expentive pursued.

As iong as the influence of the Expentive pursued.

As iong as the influence of the Expentive pursued.

As iong as the influence of the Expentive principles and measures necessary to promote the publy of good, the expensive power may be said to set within the spheror analysis of the expensive power may be said to set within the spheror analysis of the expensive power such operation of the Govern ment. But when it influence alone, one come ted with any x, stan of measures or policy, it is a certain indication of the max approach of irresponsible and deepntic power. When it attaley, that point it will be difficult to find anywhere in our system a power sufficient to restrain its progress to despotism.

On the 6th of August, 1852, Mr. Housto'n introduced into the Sensite the following resolution:

"Receled, That a Committee of five he appoint ted to inquire into

"Rescleed, That a Committe of five be appointed to inquire into abuses, bribery, or hand in the prosecution of claims before Congress, Commissions, or the Departments, or in passing through Congress hills embracing private individual or separate interests, or in obtaining or granting contracts; and that soil Committee have power to send for persons or papers, and examine witnesses under oath."

under oath."

On the 22d of March, 1853, Mr. Borland made a report, by which it appeared that they had examined witnesses bearing heavily upo a the President, Mr. Fillmore, and other high Exo autive officers. It is to be observed that no resistant e was made to that in-

be observed that no resistant a was made to that inquiry.

On the 25th of February, the President addressed a note to Mr. Underwood, a mply denying the truth of the testimony of Robert S mith as it affected him, he having been theretofore wotified of its contents.

With these precedents before them, your Committee have felt at liberty to investigate the conduct of the President of these Uv ited States, the officers of the Government, not only as to whether they had, by money, patronage, or other improper means, sought to influence the action of Congress, or any Committee thereof, for or agail ist the passage of any bill, &c., but as to the many er in which the patronage of the Government, by sanction of the President or any of his subordinates, I has been administered in subsidizing the public funds, in carrying elections, State or Federal, or in effecting the elegislation of either branch of Congress, believing that either of these subjects of inquiry are properly within the purview of the resolution.

LECOMPTON CONSTITUTION, &C.

Your Committee first direct the attention of the House to that portion of the testimony which relates to the Kanss a policy of the present Administration of the Government. The patriot will moorn, the historian will plane with astonichment, over this shameless record. Accentemed as the American people are to the errors and crimes of those in power, they will read this exposure with feelings of unmingled inoignation. The facts revealed by the testimony prove conclusively.

First: The emphatic and unmistakable pledges of the President, as well before as after his election, and the pledges of all his Cabinet, to the doctrine of leaving the people of Kansas "perfectly free to form and "regulate their domestic matinations in their own "way." LECT IMPTON CONSTITUTION, AC.

regulate their domestic institutions in their own "way."

Scound: The deliberate violation of this pledge, and the attempt to convert Kansas into a Slave State by means of forgeries, frauds, and force.

Third: The removal of and the attempt to disgrace the aworn agents of the Administration who refused to violate this pledge.

Fourth: The open employment of money in the passage of the Lecompton and English bills through the Congress of the United States.

Fifth: The admission of the parties engaged in the work of electioneering those schemes, that they received enormous sums for this purpose, and the proof of the checks upon which they were paid by an agent in the Administration.

in the Administration.

Sixth: The offer to purchase newspapers and news

of the checks upon which they were paid by an agent in the Administration.

Sixth: The offer to purchase newspapers and newspaper editors by offers of extravagant sums of money.

Secuth: And finally, the proscription of Democrats of high standing who would not support the Lecompton and English bills.

The evidence of the Hon. Robert J. Walker is conclusive as to the first of these facts, and it is so compact and clear as to require no comment. A gentleman born in a Fice State, a Democrat of high standing and approved authority, he convicts the President and his Cabinet, not alone of daplicity and inconsistency, but of treachery to himself as a public officer, after they had im lored him to accept a perilous and profitless position, and to a principle which they were the first to present to his favor. The treatment which Governor Walker received evinces a depth of ingratitude unusual, even among politicians. It shows how, even in our happy country, power may not only be used to destroy an honest citizen, but also be wielded to over-throw the vital elements of constitutional liberty. He was selected as the best instrument to carry out the promise of permitting the people of Kansas "to form" and regulate their domestic institutions in their own "way." Techned into Kansas by the representation that if he settled the Kansas question it would add new laurels to his name, he went forth armed with the assurances, written and verbal, of the National Adminis ration, that he would be sustained and strengthened in the good work. He remained long enough to see himself betrayed and deserted, and the people of Kansas turned over to the keeping of reckless officials and Pro-Slavery mobs. It has been frequently alleged, and as frequently denied, that the Administration of President Buchanan intended converting Kansas into a Slave State. Elected as he was, upon the distinct understanding that the destiny of Kansas should be decided by the people of Kansas and advocated all over the Northern ser timent upon this subject, it was i that his was the hand that struck the blow at the sacred right he had so estentationally defended, and yet Gov. Walker, and abundant cotemporaneous witnesses, fas-ten this ineffaceable stigma upon the name of James

The impression, however, which will be made upon the country by Gov. Walker's testimony, establishing as it does, most conclusively, the triple crune of the Administration in deserting first, a sacred principle, then faithful public servants, and finally in attempting by forgery, force, and fraud, to make Kansas a Slave State—strong and lasting as this impression must be, it will sink into insignificance before the astounding developments contained in the testimony respectively of Mr. Wendell, Mr. Bean, and Mr. F. W. Walker. Fortnastly for the cause of truth, the evidence of these witnesses does not depend upon their own admissions, however relactantly or fully made. The appalling fact that money was lavishly expended to carry the Lecompton and English bills is unanswerably proved by the books and other records of the Bank of the Metropolis at Washington, through which the parties conducted their business operations. With all the ingenuity of those parties to escape the responsibility of so degrading a position, the fact is proved by their unconscious contradictions of each other; and in at least one case, that of F. W. Walker, who has laid himself open to the grave charge of perjury, the House of Representatives took prempt action by expelling him from the reporters gallery as an attaché of The New-York Express; a decree which in itself is the best construction that could be placed upon the accusation that money was used to carry the Lecompton and English bills through the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Wendell, in his testimony, to which the House is respectfully referred, admits that he expended between \$30,000 and \$40,000 for this purpose. He is a The impression, however, which will be made upon

Air, Wenden, in his testimony, to which the House is respectfully referred, admits that he expended between \$30,000 and \$40,000 for this purpose. He is a witness whose creditility cannot be impeached, at least by the Administration. He has borne the very closest relations to the venerable head of that Administration. He has been consulted by Cabinet Ministers, and by the intimate friends of the President, and his constitutional decisions. the intimate friends of the President, and his constitu-tional advisers. They took him into their secrets in 1857, after he had made himself universally known as a daring and somewhat reckless operator in the jobs and contracts of the Departments. Hence, whou Mr. Wendell swears to having spent that large amount of money to carry the Lecompton and English bills, and when this expenditure is proved by his bank books, and by the confessions or admissions of such of his agents as your Committee have been able to bring before them, the conclusion is irresistible that he acted before them, the conclusion is irresistible that he acte throughout, with the consent, if not the knowledge, of the President of the United States. Your Committee need not multiply comments upon this part of the revelations of nationed in the testimony, save to add that it was antural that what began in treachery to principle and to friends, should terminate in confessed and unexam-

pled corruption.
The testimony of John W. Forney, the present Clerk The testimony of John W. Forney, the present Gerk of the House of Representatives, is not to be overhooked in this connection. While it shows a general willingness on the part of the President to subsidize the public press, it proves, also, the strong determination to my all who could be bought, and to crush out the bonest men who could not be bribed or seduced into an affiliation with the Administration in its Lecompton policy. The evidence shows clearly that Mr. Forney was offered the printing of the Post-Office blanks, seem at least \$20,000, as the condition that he should, worth at least \$20,000, as the condition that he should, by an editorial no longer than a man's hand, promise subserviency to the Administration on its Kansas

It is due to the Committee that it should now ! It is due to the Committee that it should now be stated that Alexander Hay, who received over \$20,000 at the hands of Mr. Wendell, to be employed in the passage of the Lecompton and English bills, was twice subpened by order of your Committee, and failed to appear. Process was thereupon issued by order of the House to compel his attendance which Mr. Hay avoided; and the most strennous efforts on the part of the officers of the House failed to procure his arrest.

When it is remembered that at the outset 24 members of the House of Representatives opposed the Kansas policy of the Administration, and that this number

finally decided down to twelve, and enough were found to carry the bill through the House, the Committee leave it to the contry to judge "whether the "President of the United States or any other officer of the Government has, by money, patronugs, or other improper means sought to influence the action of "Congress, or any Committees thereof, for or against the particle of the parties of the particle of the parti

Mr. Train moved that Meerrs, thekman and Adrian be summoned before the Committee.

Mr. Winstow objected on the ground that the Honse had ordered a Special Committee, on the motion of Mr. Hoard, to examine the matters with which those gentlemen had been connected.

Mr. Covort said that, as it appeared likely that the examination of the persons named would protract the session, and as they had already made their charges in the House, he was willing to let the matter go, and pursue it no further.

the House, he was wining to let the matter go, and pursue it no further.

The Committee being equally divided (Mr. Olin being absent) the motion of Mr. Train was not agreed to.

The Hon. Mr. Montgomery of Pennsylvania, a member of this House, was twice summoned before this Committee, and declined to appear. Your Committee did not feel at liberty to ask the House to compel his attendance.

AND OTHER PUBLIC OFFICES.

Your Committee under the second clause of the first resolution, under which they were appointed, have directed their attention to the charges of corruption and malpractice in the administration of the officers of the Government at Philadelphia. Their investigation has been directed principally to two points, viz.:

First: The improper combinations among the federal officers with a view to control the sentiments and preferences of the people in their primary political movements.

preferences of the people in their primary pointed movements.

Second: The improper and corrupt use of the public moneys in the employment of persons in the public service, in violation of law and government regulations; and the efforts on the part of the officers of the Government to defeat the statutes of the United States, exacted for the purpose of protecting the public treasury from unjust claims and improvident and unnecessary expenditures.

treasury from unjust claims and improvident and unnecessary expenditures.

In relation to each of these points your Committee
have been informed of various instances of the corruptions existing in the management of the Philadelphia
Custom-House and Navy-Yard. Your Committee
have confined their investigations to a few of race place
of cases, but sufficient to establish the allegation, that,
on the part of certain officers hooding high positions
unser the present Administration, very little regard
has been had either to the laws of Congress, or to their
duty as public officers.

uneer the present Administration, very little regard has been had either to the laws of Congress, or to their duty as public officers.

In relation to the first point, the evidence shows a most reckless disregard, by the Collector of the Port of Philadelphia, of the rights of the people of the State of Pennsylvania in the free and untranuncled exercise of their political rights as citizens. It appears from the evidence that he has abused the powers of his office, and used the public patronage under his control in unjustifiable attempts to direct and manage political party organizations which belong exclusively to the citizens of a sovereign State, and with which the executive officers of the Federal Government, as such, cannot interier without endangering the most sacred rights of the people, and weakening our system of government by destroying all confidence in and respect for those who administer the laws. The evidence on this subject is found in the testimony of John H. Bryant, Francis Grice, Samuel B. Grice, Francis McCornick, John F. Schell, Andrew Brumaker, George Downey, Patrick Lafferty, and John Dunn, the few witnesses that your Committee have examined in relation thereto.

In relation to the second point of inquiry, your Committee have established, by incontestible evidence, a flagrant disregard and violation of law on the part of sone of the officers and employees in the Philadelphia Custom-House and Navy-Yard, and especially in relation to Joseph B. Baker, the Collector of the Port of Philadelphia, and his brother George W. Baker, amounting to a series of feionies, subjecting the guilty parties to presecution and punishment in the District or Circuit Court of the United States. Your Committee would feel disposed to recommend to Congress some immediate action upon this subject; if, in view of the total disregard that has been paid by the executive branch of the Government to a former recommendation made in the case of Mr. Seaman, former Superintendent of

of the Government to a former recommendation made in the case of Mr. Seaman, former Superintendent of Public Printing, and of the complicity of the President in protecting the parties now referred to by retaining them in office for nearly three mouths after the matter had been brought to his notice and to the heads of the proper departments, your Committee could entertain any well-grounded hope that such a recommendation would be regarded. The subject, however, is one for the proper consideration of the Executive and his prosecuting officers at Philadelphia, and if they, as faithful rubble functionaries having a due regard to their oaths of office, are disposed to discharge the du-ties imposed upon them by law, they will do it without

these imposed upon the in by law, they will do it without being called upon by the legistative branch of the Government, unbiased by any relationship and uncontrolled by any consideration of party ties.

Joseph B. Baker is the Collector of the port of Philadelphia, appointed by Mr. Buchanan in 1857 to that post. He seems to have been in the entire confidence post. He seems to have been in the entire confidence of the President in matters relating to Pennsylvania, and the person to whom he has intrusted the distribation of much of the patronage in that State, and especially the management of the ward politics of that city and State. He also seems to have had considerable agency in keeping up, by contrivances to procure funds out of the public treasury, "The Pennsylvania This paper would appear to have been principally supported by contributions from the Executive Printing fund. George W. Baker, the brother of the Cellector, and a connection by marriage of the President, was, up to a period of time since the appointment of this Committee, the editor of that paper. The periodical contributions from the Executive Printing fund, amounting to \$12,000 per annum, do not appear to have been sufficient to afford compensation to the editor; and the receipts from the revenue seem to have used for that purpose. ed for that purpose. The office of Assistant-Cashier and Disbursing Clerk

The office of Assistant-Cashier and Disbursing Clerk in the Custom-House, was vacated some months previous to the 15th of November, 1858, by the promotion of John Goodycar, the former Assistant-Cashier, to the office of Cashier, made vacant by the death of George W. Burr, on the 15th of November, 1858. The Collector, by and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, appointed his brother to fill this vacancy at a salary of \$1,200 per annum. So far as can be ascertained no publicity was given to this appointment. The appointee never appeared at his deak, nor discharged any of the duties of his office, and, nithough the act of Congress of 3d of March, 1849, Section 6 of Statutes at large, page 329, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to make, at each session of Congress, a report of all the persons employed and occupied in each Custom-House of the United States, and the salary paid to each, we do not find the name of George W. Baker in the Blue-Book, which is compiled from such report.

This amirgion may be the result of the fact that Mr.
Baker was well known, in the Treasury Department, never to have been employed or occupied at his lawful

duties in the Custom-House.

George W. Baker, in his testimony, made a lame attempt to instiry his appointment on two grounds.

First: That he acted as a sort of private secretary to the Collector; and, Secondly: That his appointment was required to assist the Discret-Attorney of the United States in the discharge of his duties in matters connected with the revenue service. Both of these ave proved signal failures. In regard to the first, if have proved signal failures. In regard to the first, if he did act as such private secretary, there is no hav or regulation authorizing his payment for such services on of the public treasury. The Collector of that port receives a salary of \$6,000 per annum, the highest paid to any officer at that Port of Philadelphia; and if he was not able to discharge the duties pertaining to his office, and desired an amannensis to not him in the performance of his cuties, he should have provided the means for his compensation without lending himself to the commission of perjury in order to obtain illegally for his brother such compensation from the public treasury. Besides, there does not appear to be any evidence in support of this allegation; on the contrary, Mr. G. W. Baker was himself wholly mable to give to your Committee any satisfactory account of his position; and although he has been for two months aware of the charge against him, he has not attempted to furnish to the Committee vicence that he has ever performed any of the dottes pertaining to his office, or in any manner connected pertaining to his office, or in any manner connected with the Custom-house, except in the single instance

referred to hereafter.

In regard to the second excuse offered by Baker to justify this appointment, viz: that of assisting the Dis-

triet Attorney, your cognitites submit that the attempt is clearly negatived by the testimony. The only instance in which has ever attempted to aid the District Attorney was in a single case where he was detailed to hunt up some testim ny in support of a cause pending in Court, in which, according to his own statement, he does not ar pear to have done anything, and only attempted to discharge his daty by making a ascless trip to New York, and on a subsequent occasion when he was at hed by the District-Attorney to perform a similar duty in relation to another cause, he declined on the ground that he was too busily engaged in the business of a steamwhip line; a matter wholly disconnected with the Custom-House. In addition to this evidence that Mr. George W. Baker was not engaged in the discharge of the duties of his office, and that these excuses are sheer pretexts to cover up a frand upon the revenue, is the significant fact stated in the testimony of James C. Vandyke, the District-attorney, that the appointment of Mr. Baker was made more than three mont's prior to the necessity of his services in such caser; and another important fact is, that so far from aiding the District-Attorney and the Collector of the Port in the protection of the revenue, he, while holding this office in the Custom-House, and walls in the monthly receipt of his pay from the United States, appeared before the United States authorities to defend persons charged with a violation of the revenue laws, as appears from the certified record from the docket of the United States Commissioners, as printed with the testimony.

This brief review of the facts, which appear more

United States Commissioners, as printed with the testimony.

This brief review of the facts, which appear more
fully in the testimony, imposes apon your committee
the duty of calling the attention of the House to the
law on this subject. Your committee are of the opinion that all the laws enacted for the safety of the public moneys should be strictly regarded; and it can hardly he expected that the class of lesser offenders against
law and public justice can be checked in the perpetration of crime if those in high places, and having the
confidence of the heads of the departments, are permitted with impunity to violate their obligations to the
laws, by which they should be controlled. Nor can
you check the frequent occurrence of stupendous
frauds and defalcations if excesses are to be allowed
and toleration given to those who are detected in the
commencement of their career of petty pilfering upon
the public treasury.

he public treasury. The act of Corgress of May, 1822, 9 Stat. at Large, The act of Corgress of May, 1822, 9 Stat. at Large, page 696, provides that no a counts for services of any clerk or other person employed in any daties in relation to the collection of the revenue shall be allowed until such clerk or person shall have certified on oath or affirmation that the same services have been performed. Section 13 of the same act provides that every, Collector, Naval Officer, and Surveyor shall, together with his accounts of the expenses incident to his office, render a list of the clerks employed by him, stating the rate of compensation allowed to

dent to his effice, render a list of the expenses incredent to his effice, render a list of the clerks employed by him, stating the rate of compensation allowed to each, and the duties which they severally perform.

In pustfuance o these sections of the law, G. W. Baker, at stated morthly periods from the 30th of November, 1858, to the 30th September 1859 and at quarterly periods from the 30th of September, 1859, to the 31st March, 1860, presented to the Collector of the Port an account in which he claims from the Government payment at the rate of \$1,200 per annuar; these accounts, being thirteen in number, and each accompanied with an eath that he, the said G. W. Baker, has performed his services as stated in said account, to wit, his services as clerk, &c., in the Philadelphia Custom-House. These vouchers, so presented, are in pursuance of the egulations of the Department, regularly transmitted by the Collector of the Port to the Commissioner of Customs, accompanied with the statement required by the 13th section of the act of May, 1822.

Now, assuming, as is clearly shown by the testimony,

Customs, accompanied with the statement required by the 13th section of the act of May, 1822.

Now, assuming, as is clearly shown by the testimony, that G. W. Baker did not discharge the duties of the office to which he was appointed, and that the Collector of the Port was cognizant of that fact, they are both guilty of high crimes under acts of Congress. The first, the act of March 3, 18.5, fourth statutes at large page 118, which provides that if any person, in any case, matter, bearing, or other proceeding, where an oath or offirmation shall be required to be taken or administered, under or by ony law or laws of the United States, shall upon the taking of such oath or affirmation swear or affirm falsely, every such person so offending, shall be deemed guilty of perjury, and shall on coa viction thereof, be punished by fine not exceeding \$2,000, and by imprisonment at hard labor not exceeding five years, according to the aggravation of the offense. "And if any person or persons shall knowingly and wilfully procure any such perjury, "to be committed, every such person so offending shall be deemed guilty of subornation of perjury, and shall on conviction thereof be punished by fine, "not exceeding \$2,000, and by imprisonment not exceeding five years, according to the aggravation of the offense."

Your Committee submit that each of the oaths taken by George W. Baker in conformity to the act of May, 1802, constitutes the crime of perjury on his must, and

"the offense."

Your Committee submit that each of the oaths taken by George W. Baker in conformity to the act of May, 1822, constitutes the crime of perjury on his part, and that on each occasion upon which the Collector of the Port, with the knowledge that his brother was not in the performance of the duties of his office, as required by the Treasury regulations of 1857, No. 572, accepts such oath, pays the salary thereon, and transmits such onth to the Treasury Department as a voncher in support of his account with the United States, procures, in contemplation of law, such oath to be made, and is guilty of subornation of perjury. Nor is it reasonably possible that a Collector can go astray upon this subject, for the regulations of the Treasury Department, made for the guidance of collections, &c., are very explicit.

In article 608 of such regulations, the Secretary of the Treasury in 1857, in speaking of the act of May, 1822, says:

"If any employee be paid during a period of slekness, leave of niseace, waiting for employment or mere proventive duty or the like, the eath or affirmation to be true must state the fact and period, including the nature of the duty, and if the dishurding effect assents to such eath be countives at the violation of the law and ables the crime of perjury. If any imposition is practiced upon him in making it, it will be his duty to prosecute the offender as soon as he comes to the knowledge of the fact."

lew and abets the crime of perjury. If any imposition is practiced upon him in makin it, it will be his duty to prosecute the offender as soon as he comes to the knowledge of the fact."

It has been held by the Circuit Court of the United States, in the United States vs. Babcock, 4 McLean's Rep., 113, that the act of the 3d March, 1825, above quoted, applies to ouths made in behalf of claims against any of the departments of the United States Government; and also, to ouths taken in pursuance of a regulation or in conformity with the usage of the Treasury Department, if such affidavit would be admissible evidence at the Department in support of a claim against the United States. See United States vs. Bailey, 9 Peters, 2-8. Peters, 2-8.
The second statute to which your Committee call at-

The second statute to which your Committee call attention as having in this transaction been violated by the Collector and his brother, G. W. Baker, is the first section of the act of 3d March, 1823. 3 Statutes at Large, 771. This statute provides:

"That it any person or persons shall falsely make a cause or procue to be falsely made or willfully aid or assist in folsely making any deed, order, certificate, power of attorney receipt or other string, for the purpose of obtaining or receiving or enabling any other person or persons to obtaining or receiving or enabling any other person or persons to obtaining or receiving or enabling any other person or persons to obtaining or receiving or enabling any other person or persons to obtaining or receiving or enabling any sum or sums of measey or shall transmit to or present at, or cause or procure to be transmitted or presented at any office or offices of the Government of the United States any deed, power of attorney, order, certificate, receipt, or other verificate, receipt, or other verificate, receipt, or other units any office or offices of the Government of the United States any deed, power of attorney, order, certificate, receipt, or other verificate, receipt, or writing, here spoken of, it is not necessary that the paper should be in itself a forged paper. The evident intention of the law is to protect the Trem my from mea oven of a genuine paper con aining an assertion of that which is false. This is held by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the United States vs. State, 8 Howard, p. 48.

Your Con mittee therefore submit that the assertion contained in the vouchors of G. W. Baker, that he had performed the services for which he chaimed \$100 year month being false, be is mility under this act of

contained in the vonchers of G. W. Baker, that he had performed the services for which he claimed \$100 per month, being false, he is guilty under this act of uttering and publishing, and of presenting to an officer of the United States, a false certificate is support of his claim for salary; and the Collector, knowing such assertion to be false, is guilty under this act of transmitting to an officer of the Government such false certificate in support of and in relation to his accounts as Collector.

mitting to an officer of the Government such false certificate in support of and in relation to his accounts as Collector.

There public function aries baving violated the law, it appears by the letters of Mr. Vandyke to Mr. Bachaum, dated March 16, 1860 that complaint was made by some entizens in Philadelphia, that he, in pursuance of his official duty, determined to prosecute the officers i and it also appears that, in pursuance of this high sense of duty, he wrote to the Treasury Department on the 15th and 17th days of February, 1860, asking for information that seemed necessary in order to determine whether a prosecution could be maintained. That information was furnished by the Department in the letters of the Commissioner of Cautoms to Mr. Vandyke, dated the 17th and 27th of February, 1860. But this prosecution seems to have been most effectually prevented by the President who, on the 4th of March, 1860, a few days after the inquiry at the Treasury Department, informs Mr. Vandyke that, in accordance with the views of the Secretary of the Treasury he had determined to make a change in his office. The Secretary, at the time he desired this removal, must necessarily have been fully aware of the depardations by the Hakers, and the only rational inference is, that the removal was demanded and made in order to screen the malfeassuse in office of a political favorite, and his brother, who edited in Philadelphia an Administration organ.

It appears by the letter of Mr. Vandyke to the President, dated 24th March, 1860, that the President desired Mr. Vandyka to permit Mr. Baker to control the choice of delegates to the Charleston Convention. The fact that these delegates had been chosen may have been and most probably was an all-powerful desiders.

choice of delegates to the Charleston Convention. The fact that these delegates had been chosen may have been and most probably was an all-powerful desidera-tum with Mr. Buchanan in taking the most effectual made of preventing the prosecution of a friend whom he considered a controlling political influence in that dele-gation. It is now upward of three months since the transl upon the revenue, and these repeated perjuries

have been brought to the knowledge of the Administra-tion, and yet the guilty partice have not only gone un-punished out are retained in office in charge of the rev-ence of the second post in importance of the United

States.

Your Committee gubmit that such conduct on the part of the Executive and the Secretary of the Treasury is a subject for the highest censure.

As a part of the same class of irregularities, your Committee call attention to the payment of salaries by the naval storekeeper in the Philadelphia Navy-Yard, to Theophitos Fisks and Charles Cummings, neither whom was at any time in the performance of any of the duties of their appointments, and to the case of Charles Clement, who signed the pay-roll, but did not receive any portion of his salary, leaving it in the hands of the naval storekeeber, John Cummings, for his own profit.

of the naval storekeeber, John Cummings, for his own profit.

Your Committee, for want of time, have not been able to pursue the inve-tigation into the management of the Post-Offices to any considerable extent. It appears that in the Detroit Post-Office one Harry Scovel was the local mail agent, and received the salary as such. He is what is known as the "items" man or local editor of The Free Press, an Administration organ in that city. His salary was \$160 per month, for which he rendered little or no service, his duties being performed by a man who was employed by the railroad to deliver the mail bags, Scovel paying him \$25 a month. Henry J. Alvord, a Democratic editor in that city, held a situation in the same Post-Office, at \$500 a year, which weasubstantially a sinceure.

year, which was substantially a sinecure.

EXECUTIVE BINDING.

The Executive binding was continued in the hands of Cornelius Wendell in violation of the statutes of 1558, chap. 154, see, 14, stats, at large vol. II, page 327. This, upon the testimony of William Petubone and Columbus Alexander, two highly respectable gentlemen, practical binders, residing in Washington, was at a loss to the Government of at least \$50,000 per annum, or whatever the Government might choose to make it, as Mr. Alexander offered to do the work at 33 per cent less than the Government was then paying. The following extracts from his testimony will show the character of the proposition he submitted to the Department of the Interior, as also to Mr. Bowman, late Superintendent of the Public Printing:

Department of the Interior, as also to Mr. Bowman, late Superintendent of the Public Printing:

Q. Have you, within the last three years, made bits or proposals to do tinding for the Executive Department; and if so, to which Department did you make them?

A. In July, 1887, I made a proposition in writing to the Department of the Interior, proposing to do the binding for that Department at 33 per cert less than they were then paying for it, in the month of September following I renewed my older, thinking, as I had not heard from R, that the Department in the multiplicity of its basiness, might have overlooked it; and I made the further proposition that, if they did not think proper to accede to my former proposition, I would pay into the Treasary, for the use of the Covernment, the sum of \$10,000, provided they would give me the contract at the process then paid, for the binding of that one Department close from September, 1857, to the 4th of March, itel. that upon the signing and scaling of the contract I would pay that amound over to the Government for the Government use. My object was to show to the Secretary-to strike him forefolly at once—that it was a matter of some Importance, of some interest to the Government. I thought perhaps that the proposition of a reduction of the price 33 per cent did not stake him as being a matter of much importance; but I thought the sum of \$10,400 would certainly open his eyes to some interest.

Q. We either of these propositions accepted?

one intent.
Q. Were either of these propositions accepted?
A. They were not accepted; that is, the Secretary never cor

A. They were not accepted; that is, the occretary never condescended to bettee them.

Q. Is there any tenson you know of yoursell, independent of
that, why the Secretary reinsed to accept your proposition?

A. No, Sir, he never made any communication to me upon the
subject.

Q. Itad you any conversation with him after this law was
passed compelling the Departments to give the work to practical Q. Had you any conversation with him after this law was passed compelling the Departments to give the work to practical persons? A. I never approached him upon the subject; I saw that there was an indeposition to pay any attention to it, as I had tomerly seen in the Superintendent of the Public Printing, when he had control of the Executive binding.

Mr. Winslow—I chiect to that.
The Witness I know that fact.
By Mr. Winslow—Q. How do you know it? A. For the best

had to merly seen in the Superintenaent of the Public Printing, when he had control of the Executive binding.

Mr. Winstow—I object to that.

The Winters—I know that fact.

By Mr. Vinelow—Q. How do you know it? A. For the best treach in the weeld: I made the proposition myself to the Superintend in of the Public Printing, and he decined it.

By the Chairman—Q. Have you any estimate of the profits to be cerived from doing all the work for all the Departments! A. Well, Sir, I could safely say that it would be from thirty to fity per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent; I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent. I should be very glad to take it now at fifty per cent less than allowed ander the Printing at of 1832; the printing being for the Executive Departments and the binding for the thirman—Q. Do you know the probable amount of the printing and binding for the Departments for a year! A. They can roke it slines at now at the period and they can roke it slines at now at year what the exigencies of the Department or the good of the public interest requires that Sertian binding or printing about they choose; it depends entirely upon the Department, they can cut out an order at any time at they take preper and say that the exigencies of the Department or the good of the public interest requires that Sertian binding of the different Departments have amounted to a year since the commencement of Mr. Bachasset's administration? A. I cannot say that I have examined rittically to secretain the amount, but I should think the binding, to the best

an ount, but I should think the ouncil, to the speak of all the Departments.

The striute was framed by and passed Congress upon the suggestion of Mr. Pettibone himself. After its passage Mr. Pettibone became an applicant to the Department for this work. He called the attention of the Fresident to the law in a letter which appears in the evidence. The manner in which Mr. Pettibone was treated by the President appears from the following extracts from his testimony:

Q. Die you hand that letter to the President in person, or did you send it to him? A. I sent it to him.

Q. Iria you see him atteward in relation to it? A. I slid; after I sent it to the President it remained some three weeks be fore I heard anything of it. I then caused a note to be addressed respectively to him, requesting him to refer my communication to the Attorney General. A few days after that note had been sent I called at the Attorney-General, of the lated the clera to show it to me, and be old on; thad the indovement on it: "Referred to the Attorney-General, but not for his opinion." I called called again and saw the paper with this second indorement, as near as I can remember the works:

"As the Cabbest have had this matter under consideration and have acted upon it, I decline interfering." This was signed

"J. B.," the President's own signature, as I was informed. I will say here that I called upon the President after Judge Bleck informed me of the first indorement. He replied to me, "Why,

"I have sent your communication to the Attorney-General." I said, "I am aware of that, Mr. President; but the paper is indored in such a way that the Attorney-General cunnot give an "opinion." "Why, now is that!" said he. I told him that it was indoresd, "Referred to the Attorney-General cut not for his opinion." Why, now is that!" said he. I told him that it was indoresd, "Referred to the Attorney-General cut not for his opinion." Says he, "Is that so?" "Yes, Sir," I replied.

"How do you know?" "Because, I have seen the paper my, "sail. He seemed to express surprise. I then asked if I could still have the opinion of the Attorney-General. "Yes," he replied. I then said, "Flow shell I get it? shall I go to Judge "Elack and say, as coming from you, that he can judge "You be opinion in reference to that law." "I called upon Judge Bleck and hofemed him of what the President had told me. He replied. "You his opinion in reference to that law." "I called upon Judge Bleck in within see he to give you an opinion. I will do so with pleanne." I called upon Judge Black the next day, and he tald me that he had seen the President to day and sak hum about it, and if he was those and to be ye you an opinion. I will do so with pleanne." I called upon Judge Black the next day, and he tald me that he had seen the President and the President declined into-fering. He said that as the Cobinet had had this matter under consideration, and had decided it, he declined interfering with it. After Jucge Elack had informed me what he had said, I called upon the President, and add to him, "Mr. P esident, did I un"dermand you aright? you a

The President, while professing to Mr. Petitione to be desirous of executing the law, and his willingness that the opinion of the Attorney-General should be taken for the guidance of the departments, indorses to the Attorney-General Mr. Petitione's letter—" Refer-"red to the Attorney-General, but not for his opin-

ica."
This persistent violation of law is only surpassed by the meanness of such an act. The inference is obvi-ous, viz: to retain this patronage in the hands of the President's friend, and most efficient operator, Corne-

PRINTING.

The evidence herewith submitted proves beyond a doubt that the prices paid for the Executive printing, and for binding, have been utterly disproportionate to the price has been doubt the price has and for binding, have been utterly disproportionate to the work done. The excess beyond a fair price has been with the knowledge and consent, if not by the direct order of the President, squandered upon a profli-gate press, devoted to the interests of the Administrabeen with the Knowledge and consent, it not by the direct order of the President, squandered upon a profigate press, devoted to the interests of the Administration—upon "The Pennsylvanian," "The Argus," and "The Union." It appears from the testimony of Mr. Wendell, that he contracted to do the printing of the Post-Office blanks, agreeing to pay to Mr. Rice, of "The Pennsylvanian," 43 per cent of the gross amount to be received for such printing. The original arrangement, and the subsequent modifications of it, will fully appear from the following extracts from the testimony of Mr. Wendell:

Q. And I understand from your testimony that you made an arrangement, with him for 43 cents in the dollar! A. Giving him 43 cents in the dollar yes, Sir.
Q. And that you ceased after a time to pay him the money under that central, and afterward paid a part of it to "The "Argus." Yes, Sir.
Q. Did you receive any written or verbal order from the President of the United States, or the Postmaster-General, to divert any portion of that mency—that 13 per cent—from Wm. Illies, who you say was writted to receive it under your agreement, and eart-maid grate order.
Q. Any written or verbal order? A. There was a verbal understanding that Mr. Severus should participate in the 33 per cent. in April or May, I think, following the agreement with Mr. Rice, which was in December, there was a verbal understanding that Mr. Severus of The Argus should be reduced to 21b per cent.
Q. Let me stop you here for a moment; was not all that maters after you declined to go on with the arrangement —the Mr. Rice's share should be reduced to 21b per cent.
When they was not all that maters after you declined to go on with the arrangement —the Mr. Rice's share should be reduced to 21b per cent. the idea was that Mr. Rice's share should be reduced to 21b per cent.

Q. Let me stop you here for a moment; was not all that maters after you declined to go on which was alward by the Mr. Rice's share should be reduced to 21b per cent; the other. 21b per cent was the

Gerred the ratio to the Postmanter-General.

Q. Did you hold any conversations with the President of the matter I A. Yes, Si those conversations the President of the matter I A. Yes, Si those conversations the President met says. The President was desirous that Rice should cannot say. The President was desirous that Rice should connecting I twas a matter of request conversation as between the President and Postmanter General, and myself and Mr. and Gov. Eigher, frequent, often

Q. What was the occasion or motive as expressed, if any, this revocation of the contrast with Mr. Rice I A. In order answer your question (nil), I will have to give you a brief heavest of the property of the president with Mr. Rice I A. In order

Q. What was the occasion or metive as expressed, if any, for this revocation of the central with Mr. Rice? A. In order to answer your question fully, I will have be give you a brief history of the matter. Mr. Rice was desirous of procuring a portion of the printing to smalled The Penersylearian, and Mr. Wended we equally desirous of having it for The Union, because The Union had no sustemance from Congress. The effice or proprietor of the organ generally had been the Printer of one or the other Homes of Congress, and also had all the executive petronnes. I thought that, not being Printer to either Homes, and having it pay the editors put on The Union, I was entitled to what patton, as the President had, which would be about one-half of what the organ had, so that I stremonary objected to its being divertes to Mr. Rice, but was not strong enough to sustain it. The brifts ence of Mr. Rice, and the fact of his being the editor of the home organ of Mr. Rich aman, induced this order to give him the printing; but it was understood that I should do the work all the wills. That was the understanding, il making such at rangements with Mr. Rice as I could. He insisted upon 30 cents in the dollar; I protested, and family get him down to 38 cents in the dollar; that agreement ran stong through the Winter. I have in every desired the was extended that I was getting behind in any bud eas and what was left me did not support. The Union, tried to lave it evoked; Mr. Severus, through his political friends, tried the stong extended of the previous to the cleenters, when I suggested to stop paying it.

By the Chairman—Q. Suggested to whom? A. To the President the immay of Mr. Joseph B. Baker. No one will doubt that it was one of the first duties of the President to immay of Mr. Joseph B. Baker. No one will doubt that it was one of the first duties of the President to

The testimony of Mr. Wendell is formed by the testimony of Mr. Joseph B. Baker. No one will doubt that it was one of the first duties of the President to inform Congress of this enormous waste of the publis money, that the evil might be remedied by the necessary it gislation. He seems, however, to have preferred that there moneys should have been expended under the forms of law in the support of his administration, his friends and his retainers; and for this, in the opinion of your Committee, he deserves the ceusure of all houest men. It is to be hoped that this evil has been remedied by the legislation of the present session, and the Committee therefore refrain from any further remarks upon the subject.

OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF MONEY TO CARRY ELECTIONS.

further remarks upon the subject.

OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF MONEY TO CARRY ELECTIONS.

Your Committee intended, at the outset, to inquire into the improper use of money in elections by private individuals, as well as by public officers, deeming that to be within the scope and meaning the resolution passed by the House. There can be no objections to the use of money in the distribution of tracts, speeches, and public documents, for the purpose of disseminating political intelligence among the people. But when money is used for the purpose of corrupting the fraction of elections, of buying votes, and maintaing a force to overawe the timid—the management, traud, and force to control elections—more especially when this is done by the officers of the Government, and the money of the Government employed for the same purposes, the evil becomes one requiring the most careful lavestigation, and the most discreet legislation, within the several States, or of the Federal Congress.

The action of the House upon the application of your Committee for process to compel Mr. Augustus Schell to testify, having indicated to your Committee that they should not inquire into the use of money by individuals, they therefore abandoned that line of inquiry. The House afterward, upon the application of the Hou. Wm. Winslow, a member of your Committee, reversed its former action, but at so late a period in the session that your Committee could do nothing further than to pursue the investigation sought by Mr. Winslow as far as he desired.

It appears by the testimony of George Plitt that

pursue the investigation sought by Mr. Winslow as far as he desired.

It appears by the testimony of George Plitt that over \$70,000 was distributed by him as the Trensurer of the Democratic Central Committee of Pennsylvania in 1856, to carry that State for Buchanan; of this sum nearly \$20,000 was received from what is known, as the New-York Hotel Fund, and \$10,000 from W. C. N. Swift of New-Bedford, Mass., and was afterward repaid to him through the famous, as well as infumous live oak contracts. The remainder was derived from different sources, quite a large sum thereof being collected in the chape of assersments upon the employees of the Government in the offices at Washington, and the Custom House and Navy Yard at Philadelphia. The following extract from the testimony of Isaac West, who was an inspector in the Custom House during the election of 1856, is in point:

Q. Were you there at the time of the election of 1856, when

Q. Were you there at the time of the election of 1836, Mr. Buchman was elected? A. Yes, sir.
Q. What do you know about memory being raised of the ployees of the Custom House on that occasion? A. There a certain tax levied on the persons connected with the Cu-House.

A Certain tell crise.

Q. What amount on each person? A A certain percent on a person receiving \$1,000 a year: I think the tax for the P idential election was from \$30 to \$33.

Q. Do you mean for the Presidential election alone, or both Presidential and Congressional elections? A I mean Presidential election alone.

both Presidential and Congressional elections? A I mean the Presidential election alone.

Q. What about the other election? The amount was not so reat for the State election.

Q. How much was that? A That I do not recollect; it strikes me that it was from \$5 to \$7; something like that.

Q. The two, then, would amount to the neighborhood of \$\$\theta\$? A. Yes, sir, in the neighborhood.

Q. Upon what salaried officers was that? A. Those of \$1,100; rather \$1,005.

Q. Were the others assessed in proportion to these salaries? A. Yes, \$1...

Q. To whom was that money paid? A. It was generally deposited; that portion which I collected in my department, I was to the Peputy Collector, Mr. Harbison; I believe he was the Treasurer, so far as the Custom-House was concerned, and he paid it over to the Fracentive Consolites, I believe.

Q. A Political Committee? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. What was the impression—that it was rather obligatory upon them to pay I. A. That seems to be the impression; they all felt it their duty to pay that more promptly than some of their debts; that was the impression; but I do not know about whether they would have been removed it they had not paid; but it was considered obligatory. I believe.

The testimony of B. F. Slocum, J. L. Cramer, Nicholna Vecder, Josiah M. Lucas, and Stephen G. Dodge, Clerks in the Department of the Interior, are also in point. The following, from the testimony of George Plitt, is to the same effect:

Q. Did you know anything about a portion of this memory being

George Plitt is to the same effect:

Q. Did you know anything about a portion of this money being raised of the employees of the Government in Philadelphia, in the Custom-House, and elsewhere! A. Well, I think there was at that time, but I sim not certain that is or general custom. There contributions, upon she evidence, must have been with the knowledge, and at the instigation of the beads of Departments, and the disbursement of money in Pennsylvania must have been with the knowledge of Mr. Buchavan himself. The following extracte from the testimony of Mr. Wendell will establish this last sesertion.

or Air Buchaban himself. The following extracte from the testimony of Mr. Wendell will establish this last seerthon.

Q. I wish to ask you a few further questions concerning the elections in Pennsylvania. When you had an interview with Mr. Buchanen previous to the election in Pennsylvania in 1853, did you not freely talk with him in regard to the use of money to carry certain Districts. A I talked with him freely as to the assof money in elections; I do not remember as to any specine Districts; I talked about the expenses of elections generally, the large amounts of money. A I cannot say that I was compelled.

Q. Daty you not tell aim that you were compelled to use large amounts of money. A I cannot say that I was compelled.

Q. That you were using large amounts of money? A if was complicant of the fact that I contributed largely for the elections.

Q. You had conversations with him on this subject? A. It was the subject of conversation at different times, the amounts with him about carrying certain Districts how was it to be done? A. I think the most of them wanted material aid, they made suggestions as to aid required in different Districts generally, and the political affairs of their several District.

Q. Why did he call your attention to those letters calling for that kind of aid; was it because he expected you to attend to 12 A. Weil, I do not know indeed what the moving was; our conversations was generally about politics and the context going or, and the letters adjub have been shown in commection, which, in those days, were generally political, almost always; I might say my conversations with him were always of a political character.

Q. On what doccasion was it that you had these interviews with him; was fe not immediately before the election, I might eave with him; was fenot immediately before the election, and relative to the means to be made use of to carry the election?

Mr. Olin (to the Chairman)—De you suppare that he took Fundays for that propose? Witness I have been because with him on Sundays.

In this collection your Committee would fail in their duty did they not call the attention of the House to enstons proved to exist, and with the knowledge of the Precident, of allowing officers employed under the Government to be absent on leave from their posts and employed in electioneering for the party to which they belonged. Gideon G. Worcott is a notable illustration of this practice. In 1856, being then an Appraiser in the Custom-House at Philadelphia, be was "absent on leave in the State Central Committee" room some four months, during which time he rendered no service to the Government, yet received his regular salary. The practice has also prevailed in the New-York and other Custom-Houses, of appointing men temporarily for the week preceding the elections, and granting them leave of absence, that they might devote themselves to electioneering duties. This employment of the servants and moneys of the Government in aiding elections is a palpable violation of law and subversion of the rights of the people.

In view of this evidence, it is not surprising that the